

Applicants amended the Specification to insert the serial number of the co-pending commonly owned patent application.

### **DRAWINGS**

#### **FIG. 2 Legend**

The Examiner has stated that FIG. 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated, and a proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application. FIG. 2 shows a novel element, actuator 140, of the invention, and is not prior art. It is only the membrane structure that is prior art. Applicants have amended the description of FIG. 2 to clarify what is being illustrated. This amendment is supported by the specification at page 2, lines 24-27 and page 3, lines 16-20. In addition, FIGS. 3A and 3B (see page 4, line 17) and FIGS. 4A-4C (see page 5, lines 22-26) detail actuator 140 shown in FIG. 2.

#### **Objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a)**

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner stated that the interdigitated electrodes of claim 12 must be shown or the features canceled from the claim(s), and a proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Applicants respectively assert that the Detailed Description at page 4, lines 27-28 clearly states that Element 320 in Figs. 3A and 3B can be "single surface electrodes or interdigitated electrodes". Therefore, Applicants assert that the drawings meet the requirement to show every feature of the invention specified in the claim 12.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the specification is silent on how the actuators are actually activated.

The specification at page 5, lines 24-26 states, "the actuators 140 respond to the output sensors located on membrane 110 via an integrated feedback control system". Furthermore, the specification at page 4, line 9 states, "The threads are generally a metallic material", Claim 1 describes an "actuator integrated into at least one thread", and the specification at page 5, lines 12-14 states, "The caps 420 maintain the roll in its rolled configuration and also connect the roll 410 to the threads 430." Applicants respectfully assert that the specification is sufficient for someone skilled in the art.

#### 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being clearly anticipated by Applicants' own admission in the second paragraph of page 4.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment to the description of FIG. 2, clarifying that the actuator 140 is novel (and supported in the specification, as discussed earlier) overcomes the rejection by eliminating the supposed admission.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that claims 6-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants believe that that the Examiner inadvertently referenced "second paragraph" rather than "first paragraph" and assert that the earlier arguments pertaining to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and to 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections now place claims 6-18 in condition for allowance.

Applicants note the allowance of claims 19-30.